Levrary

1	BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD	
2	STATE OF WASHINGTON	
3	IN THE MATTER OF ROSS F. GREENWOOD,	}
4	Appellant,	) ) PCHB No. 1008
5 6	v. PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION	) FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, ) CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER. )
8	CONTROL AGENCY,  Respondent.	} }

This matter, the appeal of a \$250.00 Civil Penalty for burning a land clearing fire without a population density verification approval in violation of Respondent's Regulation I, came on for formal hearing before the Pollution Control Hearings Board, Chris Smith, Chairman, W. A. Gissberg and Art Brown, in Lacey, Washington, on August 24, 1976.

Appellant Ross F. Greenwood appeared pro se; Respondent Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency was represented by its attorney Keith D. McGoffin

From testimony heard and exhibits examined, the Pollution Control

Hearings Board makes these

FINDINGS OF FACT

I.

Pursuant to RCW 43.21B.260, Respondent filed its Regulation I with the Pollution Control Hearings Board and official notice thereof is hereby taken.

II.

At 9:50 a.m. on March 25, 1976, a Puget Sound Air Pollution
Control inspector observed an outdoor fire at 5409 Chicago Avenue
S.W., Tacoma, Washington. The fire was a burning of a pile of tree
clippings allegedly six to seven feet wide and four feet high. A
Notice of Violation was issued as it was determined by the inspector
that the burning was a land clearing fire and no population density
verification approval had been obtained by the Appellant as required
under Section 8.06(3) of Respondent's Regulation 1. While the subject
property is within the Tacoma urbanized area, Repondent Puget Sound Air
Pollution Control Agency did not know if a fire on the instant site
would have been approved or disapproved under Section 8.06(3).

III.

A Notice and Order of Civil Penalty in the amount of \$250.00 was assessed against Appellant on April 1, 1976, from which he timely

Section 8.06 - Land Clearing Burning. It shall be unlawful for any person to cause or allow any outdoor fire for land clearing burning: ... (3) Within the urbanized area as defined by the United States Bureau of Census unless the Agency has verified that the average population density on the land within 0.6 miles of the proposed burning site is 2,500 persons per square mile or less.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER - 2

appealed to the Board on April 6, 1976.

The agency imposed a civil penalty of \$250.00 in this instance as Appellant had been cited on January 23, 1976, for an open burning violation at another address at which time he was handed a copy of the agency regulations; no civil penalty was imposed in this earlier case. 2

IV.

The burning of the pile of clippings and debris in the instant matter was part of a cooperative neighborhood project to cut down twenty substantial fir trees which had become hazardous to adjacent homes and telephone lines. The limbs were chopped and the larger pieces were either hauled to the dump or sold. For two weeks prior to the alleged violation, Mr. Greenwood and his neighbors had been raking the smaller leavings of each tree into four or five piles and burning each pile before the next tree was felled.

Three neighbors estimated the size of the cited burning pile as less than four feet in diameter by three feet in height. The pile was on Appellant's land and had been lit by him or his designee.

V.

Appellant Greenwood did have a permit from the Lakewood Fire Department for the burning of a "residential fire."

VI.

Any Conclusion of Law hereinafter stated which may be deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER - 3

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The specific violation was Mr. Greenwood's burning of natural vegetation as owner of a rental unit rather than as resident of the unit per Section 9.02(d)(1)(i) of Regulation 1.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT.

From these Findings of Fact, the Board comes to these CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I.

Failure to obtain a population density verification is a violation of Section 8.06 of Regulation 1, entitled Land Clearing Burning. While establishing five conditions regulating residential burning, Section 8.09 of Regulation 1 has no comparable requirement for population density verification. Thus the Board must initially classify the burning to determine if the requirement allegedly violated was in fact applicable.

II.

Article 1 Section 1.07, of Respondent's Regulation 1 reads in relevant part as follows:

(mm) "Residential burning" means a small outdoor fire consisting of leaves, clippings, prunings, and wood, so long as it has not been treated by an application of prohibitive material or substances, and other yard and gardening refuse originating on lands immediately adjacent and in close proximity to a human dwelling and burned on such lands by the property owner or his designee.

(nn) "Land clearing burning" means outdoor fires consisting of residue of a natural character such as trees, stumps, shrubbery or other natural vegetation arising from land clearing projects and burned on the lands on which the material originated.

(00) "Small outdoor fire" means a fire in a pile no more than four (4) feet in diameter and three (3) feet in height.

III.

23 The proper classification of a burning pile cannot be determined
24 solely by its size. A burning may well not meet the definition of a
25 residential burning because it fails to meet the size standard established
26 thereunder (4' x 3'). Such excessive size in itself, however, does
27 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER - 4

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

not render this burning a land clearing burning subject to the requirements of Section 8.06.

IV.

Further, the fact that a number of trees are felled with consequent large amounts of clippings, etc., does not preclude resultant burnings from being considered "residential" or dictate that such burnings be deemed "land clearing." Indeed, the standards controlling residential burnings anticipate quantities of refuse in requiring under Section 8.09(3) that "Only one pile be burned at a time and each pile be extinguished before another is lighted."

v.

The Board concludes that considering the purpose of the Appellant's cited activity and the manner in which the piles were formed and burned, the character of the burning as "land clearing" is not clearly established Thus, the Board cannot conclude that Section 8.06 and its requirements are applicable to the facts of this case.

VI.

Where the applicability of a Section's requirements to a given set of facts is ambiguous to a Board experienced in interpreting the provisions of Regulation 1, no civil penalty for an alleged violation can be sustained. Particularly is this true under the facts of this case where the requirement at issue is a technical one, an effort was made to obtain a burning permit, and the pollutant impact of the allegedly unauthorized action is minimal.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER - 5

.. ¥

`3

<sup>1</sup>6

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER - 6